

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,372	12/01/2000	Hans-Rudolf Nageli	ATM-2273 5299	
7590 05/21/2004			EXAMINER	
Virgil H. Marsh Fisher, Christen & Sabol			TSOY, ELENA	
Suite 1401			ART UNIT PAPER NUMB	
1725 K Street, N.W.			1762	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			— <i>([i</i> t
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- WC
Advisory Action	09/726,372	NAGELI ET AL.	
Advisory Addion	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Elena Tsoy	1762	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence addres	ss
THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to h places the application	o a n in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropr originally set in the final Offi	riate extension ice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simpl	lifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims.	٠
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed am	iendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT p	lace the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were no	ewly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	• • •		an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>28-55</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner	•
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_	•
10. Other:		 -	
10 Outor			

Application/Control Number: 09/726,372

Art Unit: 1762

Advisory Action

1. The Arguments filed on May 13, 2004 under 37 CFR 1.116 in reply to the final rejection have been entered and considered but are not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance because claims 28-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention; and the specification also stands objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure.

Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed May 13, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- (A) Applicants argue that the Examiner has merely quoted the added material and asserted that it is a new matter. The Examiner has not even set out any reason or explanation of why the added material is new matter, or any facts to support her assertion of new matter.

The Examiner asserted that the added material, i.e. "the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating and the adhesion-promotion agent lying **below** the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic", is a <u>new matter</u> because the Examiner simply could not find the added material in the specification as filed. For these reasons, the Examiner stated that the added material is not supported by the original disclosure, and, therefore, is a new matter.

If Applicants think that the added material is supported by the original disclosure,

Applicants have to show that "the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating and the

Application/Control Number: 09/726,372

Art Unit: 1762

adhesion-promotion agent lying **below** the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic" is supported **not** by scientific/technical principles and the knowledge of one skilled in the art, but by the specification as filed.

(B) Applicants argue that section 2163.07 of MPEP states "The mere inclusion of dictionary or art recognized definitions known at the time of filing an application would not be considered new matter".

However, "the temperature at the surface of the plastic coating and the adhesion-promotion agent lying **below** the crystallite melt point (Tk) of the plastic" is **not a definition**.

(C) Applicants argue that Examples 11 and 12 of Heyes et al use the Heyes et al method including "preheating the metal strips". Accordingly, Examples 11 and 12 of Heyes et al do not anticipate any of applicants' process claims.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. Examples 11 and 12 of Heyes et al do anticipate applicants' process of claim 28 because the method of claim 28 "comprises" recited steps. Accordingly, the method does not exclude the step of "preheating the metal strips".

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elena Tsoy whose telephone number is (571) 272-1429. The examiner can normally be reached on Mo-Thur. 9:00-7:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shrive Beck can be reached on (571) 272-1415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/726,372

Art Unit: 1762

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Elsoy

Elena Tsoy Primary Examiner Art Unit 1762

May 18, 2004